

**CONFIDENTIAL**

Approved For Release 2002/01/30 : CIA-RDP80B01139A000500030008-8

**DRAFT**

T/V/M-6  
26 January 1965

UNITED STATES INTELLIGENCE BOARD  
COMMITTEE ON DOCUMENTATION

Task Team - Biographics

Minutes of the Sixth Meeting - 25 January 1965

Members or their Representatives Present

25X1A	CIA	- Mr. [REDACTED] rman
		- Mr. [REDACTED]
	DIA	- Mr. [REDACTED]
	STATE	- Mr. Mitchell Stanley
	NAVY	- Mr. Marvin E. Van Dera
	ARMY	- Mr. Paul Anderson
25X1A	NSA	- Mr. [REDACTED]
		- Mr. [REDACTED]
	AIR FORCE	- Lt. Col. Edmund M. Manning
		- Maj. Louis A. Comes
	I&NS	- Mr. John L. Keefe
	FBI	- Mr. Earl W. McCoy
	SS	- Mr. Frank S. Stoner
	CSC	- Mr. Pearley G. Buck
25X1A	CSS	- [REDACTED]

1. The minutes of the previous meeting were approved.
2. The Chairman advised the Team that the Terms of Reference, as submitted by the Team to CODIB at its last meeting, were approved with two minor additions. One was the addition of paragraph B 2 j "Other facts bearing on system effectiveness or manpower involved in finding biographic information." The second addition was to add the phrase "and recommend... follow on action" at the end of the last sentence of the Recommendations paragraph. Each member was ~~distributed~~ given a copy of the approved Terms of Reference ~~by his records~~.

**CONFIDENTIAL**

GROUP 1  
Excluded from automatic  
downgrading and  
declassification

**CONFIDENTIAL**

index facts sheet on the spot. The NSA member requested that the last sentence of paragraph 11 of the definitions be deleted ~~since~~ <sup>or irrelevant</sup> he felt there was no such problem referred to in that sentence. The group then agreed <sup>that</sup> the next step would be for some <sup>interpretations</sup> ~~to~~ <sup>corrections</sup> and observations <sup>to</sup> be prepared based on these facts. The Chairman indicated that such a paper would be prepared for the Team's consideration in the near future.

6. The Team was provided a blank chart by the Secretary entitled "Interagency Name Checks, Volume -- Time". Consideration was first given to the volume figures, ~~that might be useful for the~~ <sup>average</sup> The Secretary pointed out that what was meant here was the <sup>daily</sup> number of requests made <sup>to</sup> by each requesting agency <sup>on a daily basis</sup> to each of the <sup>other</sup> agencies. Several of the agencies have already provided these figures. It was agreed that the remainder of the members would provide the Secretary with these figures in time for the Secretary to provide a consolidated report sheet to the members by the next meeting. Considerable discussion then ensued concerning how the Team should handle ~~the report of~~ the time element. Two general approaches were contemplated. One would be to have each agency report how long it takes each other agency to provide a response to the normal request, excluding of course, those unusual cases which, for some reason, take an extremely long time. Other approaches would be to have each agency report how long it takes <sup>its</sup> agency to respond to a request from other agencies on the average for the normal cases. (It was suggested that the "normal" in both of these cases <sup>should</sup> include 80% or so of the requests being handled.) <sup>This</sup> ~~These considerations highlighted the role~~ <sup>on site</sup> brought to the point of discussion the involvement of the various liaison officers and the question was raised <sup>as to how to figure the response time under</sup> ~~at which process point~~ <sup>the approaches described above.</sup> **CONFIDENTIAL**

**CONFIDENTIAL**

would the time start running under either system described above; should it be from the time the and received the answer when the liaison officer gave and received the request, or when the request was sent and received by the home agency of the liaison officer? The next point considered was whether ~~should~~ the time be calculated at the index level or at some other point in the processing? The question of what is indeed a reply was discussed. This discussion also included whether telephone calls and special methods or special couriers should be considered in the time figures. It was generally agreed ~~here~~ that these special cases were not to be considered part of the written figures <sup>which the Team is</sup> trying to ~~be~~ arrived at. One member suggested that rather than pin-point the question to each agency, perhaps ~~if~~ the Team approached as a standards problem and defined in a general way what certain standards of response time under certain conditions that the Team observed <sup>and</sup> followed in the community. Another <sup>A</sup> member suggested that the Team view the processes <sup>and</sup> in the graphic sense including all the major elements of processing which would include the worst as well as the best cases. Considerable discussion was held concerning how <sup>yes</sup> days are counted. Those who provide the service usually count the work days. Those receiving the service usually count in calendar days. Another suggestion was for the Team to provide a CODIB-approved sample form to accompany a test group of requests.

7. From all of these suggestions it became clear that the Team members needed more time to reflect on the best way of developing <sup>about response times</sup> these facts. Therefore, the Chairman suggested that the members consider this problem, attempt <sup>to obtain</sup> an information sample <sup>and</sup> within their own offices from their operating people as to how long, in general, it takes them to get answers from other agencies and also determine

**CONFIDENTIAL**

**CONFIDENTIAL**

Approved For Release 2002/01/30 : CIA-RDP80B01139A000500030008-8

3. The Chairman cited an excellent article on computer ~~elements~~, which he thought to be of interest to the group, in the December 1964 issue of "Computers and Automation".

4. The Team next considered the cost and manpower information questionnaire that was part of the last minutes. The Secretary has constructed a chart indicating which of the agencies have responded to these questions and indicated to the group which agencies had not yet responded. It was agreed that only one combined answer <sup>in total number items 1-6</sup> ~~under question 1~~ <sup>one combined answer for questions</sup> was required for subquestions ~~1 through 6~~ in question 1, 3 and 4 <sup>and one combined answer for</sup> as well as questions 5 and 6. This means ~~in effect~~ that there will be two questions to be answered under personnel, one each under machines, supplies, space and cost projection, making a total of six answers. The Team members indicated that they would provide these answers to the Secretary in time for a consolidated report to be prepared by the Secretary by the next meeting.

5. The Team ~~next~~ considered <sup>and agreed on</sup> ~~in detail~~, the various definitions of the elements listed in attachment A to the last minutes, explaining the various columns in the biographic index facts sheet. A current corrected copy of the biographic index facts sheet was passed to the members by the Secretary. Discussion was held on the meaning of the "average number of name searches per request" and it was agreed that the procedures followed by most agencies of checking five or ten cards on each side of an individual name being searched would not be considered part of this item. Additionally, the notation of the FBI number concerning <sup>and</sup> six-way name variation check was deleted with a re-estimate <sup>no</sup> provided by the FBI member for this element. A few additional minor corrections were made by the members to the biographic

**CONFIDENTIAL**

Approved For Release 2002/01/30 : CIA-RDP80B01139A000500030008-8

**CONFIDENTIAL**

how feasible it might be to estimate the number of days that each member's agency takes to provide an "average response" (recognizing that the word average must yet be agreed upon by the Team).

8. The Chairman next pointed out that an appropriate questionnaire on name rules has not yet been prepared for the member's consideration, but that such a questionnaire would be provided the members ~~by the~~ <sup>in the</sup> ~~near future~~ <sup>next meeting</sup>.

9. The Secretary requested each of the members to provide him, <sup>& others on their behalf</sup>, by the next meeting, with an estimate of the time they had spent ~~(or had on their behalf)~~ on Team matters from October - December 1964. <sup>This has been requested by</sup> This was explained to be for the purposes of CODIB reporting.

10. The Chairman announced a firm date for the proposed symposium to be 22 and 23 April 1965, at which time the members plan to go to a site near ~~by~~ Washington for a two-day conference on Biographics. The Chairman suggested that the members come <sup>to the meeting</sup> prepared to make suggestions as to what subjects they might like to cover, ~~such as~~ <sup>as</sup> ~~for example~~ various methods of random access in computer systems, data preparation problems, name elements, name variants, etc. The Chairman also reminded the members that ~~this group~~ <sup>attendance at this symposium</sup> could be expanded ~~appropriate~~ <sup>as desired</sup> to include additional individuals <sup>the members felt</sup> would find this meeting useful.

11. It was agreed to request Lt. Gottsman, US Navy, to brief the group on the ~~name~~ <sup>and</sup> ~~the~~ <sup>settled on</sup> ~~and~~ ~~the~~ ~~group~~ <sup>at 1717 N St N.W. Rm 867</sup> ~~settle on~~ <sup>1</sup> ~~the~~ ~~group~~ <sup>25X1A</sup>

at the next team meeting to take place 11 February 1965 at 0930 hours at CIA Headquarters. A tentative date was also made for the group to visit the National Driver's Registration Service in Washington on 25 February 1965 at 9:30 A.M. Both of ~~these~~ <sup>have been confirmed</sup> ~~the~~ <sup>25X1A</sup>.

**CONFIDENTIAL**